

Appl. No. 09/886,894
Atty. Docket No. 8590
Amdt. dated September 18, 2003
Reply to Final Office Action of June 18, 2003
Customer No. 27752

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, and 4-8 are pending in the present application. No additional claims fee is believed to be due.

Applicants wish to thank Examiner Pierce for the interview on August 19, 2003. As discussed with the Examiner, the claims have been amended to recite that the web comprise stretched and unstretched regions. Antecedent basis is found page 12, lines 9-11 and page 13, lines 17-23.

Rejection Under 35 USC 112, Second Paragraph

The Examiner states that Claim 17 has been rejected as being indefinite under 35 USC 112, Second Paragraph. Claim 17 has been canceled.

Rejections Under 35 USC 102/103

The Office Action states that Claims 1, 2, 4, and 17 have been rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by, or in the alternative under 35 USC 103(a) as obvious over Proulx (U.S. Patent No. 5,304,741). Proulx discloses a ribbon connector for use as a speaker cable. The ribbon connector comprises two sets of flat conductors which are spaced apart from one another by a median strip of insulation. Proulx discloses that the ribbon connectors are individually encapsulated in insulation. The ribbon cable can be manufactured either using lamination or extrusion process. (column 3, lines 50-53)

The present invention, as amended, requires that the flat conductors are held in place by a stretched and unstretched web of dielectric material. The region of the web containing the conductors in place has not been stretched as the conductive material does not allow the web to stretch where the conductive material remains. The region of the web not containing the conductor is incrementally stretched as this is where the conductive sheet separated because it could not stretch as much as the web. The stretched region of the web remains stretched to hold the conductors in a discrete, spaced, parallel relationship. Proulx does not disclose a stretched web of dielectric material to hold the conductors in the spaced, parallel relationship. Proulx only discloses the use of an insulation material placed between the cables or encapsulating the cable. Proulx discloses typical methods of manufacturing the cable, such as lamination or extrusion. Proulx does not disclose any method of manufacturing which would result in a stretched and unstretched web of material. Therefore, Proulx does not anticipate the present invention.

Page 5 of 7

Appl. No. 09/886,894
Atty. Docket No. 8590
Amdt. dated September 18, 2003
Reply to Final Office Action of June 18, 2003
Customer No. 27752

Additionally, one having ordinary skill in the art would not have been motivated by the disclosure in Proulx to develop the present invention.

Rejections Under 35 USC 103

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, and 17 as being unpatentable over Springer, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,744,756) in view of Proulx and Claim 5 has been rejected under USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Proulx in view of Springer, et al. Springer et al. discloses the use of blown microfiber dielectric webs to insulate the cable. The blown microfiber dielectric webs are formed through typical melt blowing techniques used to make webs. Alternatively, if a microporous material is used for additional insulation, the microfiber material may be directly blown onto the microporous material. (column 6, lines 50-53) To make the ribbon cable, a simple lamination process is used. The conductors are sandwiched between two layers of dielectric material. Rolls of cable are aligned to compress the material layers (microfiber webs) where bonding occurs. (column 5, lines 1-18)

The present invention, as amended, requires that the flat conductors are held in place by a stretched web of dielectric material. The region of the web containing the conductors is unstretched and the region of the web not containing the conductors is stretched to hold the conductors in a spaced, parallel relationship. Neither Springer et al. nor Proulx discloses a stretched web of dielectric material to hold the conductors in the spaced, parallel relationship. Therefore, one having ordinary skill in the art would not have been motivated by Proulx and Springer et al. to develop the present invention.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 6-8, and 17 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ainsworth, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,924,037) in view of Proulx and Claims 6-8 and 17 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Proulx in view of Ainsworth, et al. Ainsworth et al. discloses the use of a microporous, expanded polytetrafluoroethylene (PTFE) to insulate a wire. A conductor wire is embedded in the PTFE and then compressed together around the conductor to form insulation. (column 2, lines 27-33) The insulated wire is then coated with an organic solvent solution of polyurethane. The next step is to laminate a film of extrudable polyurethane to the insulated wire coating with solvent. A compression roller may be used to contact the two films. (column 2, lines 34-58)

The present invention, as amended, requires that the flat conductors are held in place by a stretched web of dielectric material. The region of the web containing the conductors is unstretched and the region of the web not containing the conductors is stretched to hold the conductors in a spaced, parallel relationship. Neither Ainsworth et al. nor Proulx discloses a

Appl. No. 09/886,894
Atty. Docket No. 8590
Amdt. dated September 18, 2003
Reply to Final Office Action of June 18, 2003
Customer No. 27752

stretched web of dielectric material to hold the conductors in the spaced, parallel relationship. Therefore, one having ordinary skill in the art would not have been motivated by Proulx and Ainsworth et al. to develop the present invention.

Conclusion

In light of the above remarks, it is requested that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejections. Early and favorable action in the case is respectfully requested.

Applicants have made an earnest effort to place their application in proper form and to distinguish the invention as now claimed from the applied references. In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application, entry of the amendments presented herein, and allowance of Claims 1, 2, and 4-8.

Respectfully submitted,
John J. Curro, et al.

By Angela Marie Stone
Angela Marie Stone
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 41,335
(513) 634-9397

18 September 2003
Customer No. 27752

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

SEP 22 2003

OFFICIAL